

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 6 have been amended. Claims 16 and 17 have been added. Claims 1-17 now remain in the application.

The Examiner indicated that claim 13 and 14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gadeyne et al, US Patent No. 6,359,663 ("Gadeyne"). The Examiner also rejected claims 2, 3, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gadeyne in view of Kunzman, US Patent No. 6,392,717; rejected claims 4, 7, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gadeyne in view of Medin et al, US Patent No. 5,936,621 ("Medin"); rejected claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gadeyne in view of Medin and further in view of Kunzman; rejected claims 12 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gadeyne in view of Sani et al, US Patent No. 6,219,101.

Applicant asserts that none of the references cited reduce sparkle artifacts as recited and defined in the Applicant's specification. Sparkle artifacts are caused by disclination. The presence of orthogonal fields as discussed in the Applicant's specification is denoted disclination. The image artifact caused by disclination and perceived by the viewer is denoted sparkle. The areas of the picture in which disclination occurs appear to have sparkles of light over the underlying image. In effect, dark pixels affected by disclination are too bright, often five times as bright as they should be. Sparkle comes in red, green and blue colors, for each color produced by the imagers. However, the green sparkle is the most evident when the problem occurs. Accordingly, the image artifact caused by disclination is also referred to as the green sparkle problem. LCOS imaging is a new technology and green sparkle caused by disclination is a new kind of problem that will not be resolved by the technology taught in the cited references. The technology of the cited references including Gadeyne, Kunzman, Medin, and Sani, either individually or in combination would fail to reduce the sparkles as defined in Applicant's invention. Nor do these references individually or in combination suggest, mention or contemplate a method that reduces sparkle artifacts as recited in claims 1 and 6 or as further recited in dependent claims 16 and 17.

With respect to claims 5 and 10, Applicant fails to see how Gadeyne in view of Kunzman or Medin teaches or suggests a method of reducing sparkle artifacts where slew rate limits are independently selected for each of the gamma corrected video drive signal

components. With respect to claims 4, 7, and 8, once again the discussion of flicker in Medin is not comparable to sparkle artifacts as defined in the Applicant's specification.

Furthermore, it does not appear that any of the references teach frame rate multiplying and color space converting before gamma correcting the frame rate multiplied video drive signal as recited in claims 4 and 8. With respect to claim 12, once again, the reference cited concerns with filtering flicker and discloses a A/D converter 14 having a sample and hold circuit 110 and a plurality of comparators 114-120. There is no discussion or teaching of sparkle artifacts or storage of a preceding gamma corrected slew rate limited output as recited in claim 12 in the sample and hold circuit 110 of Sani nor is there suggestion or teaching of a multiplexer that uses the most significant bit of the difference signal to control selection of an output between a first and second comparator as recited in claim 15.

Although one or more of the cited references may discuss artifacts and flicker, it should be noted that this is not the same thing as sparkle artifacts as defined in the specification of the present invention. The remaining references were reviewed, but do not appear to affect the patentability of the claims as currently recited.

Thus, the Applicant respectfully believes that independent claims 1 and 6 as well as all the remaining dependent claims recite an invention that is novel and nonobvious over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103(a) and the allowance of the claims as provided herein. Applicant invites the Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would clarify any issues raised herein.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald Henry Willis

By: 

Harvey D. Fried

Registration No. 28,298

Phone: 609/734-6811

Patent Operations
Thomson multimedia Licensing, Inc.
Two Independence Way
Suite 200
Princeton, NJ 08540

August 13, 2003